

THE PLURIPOLAR HULL OF THE GRAPH OF A HOLOMORPHIC FUNCTION WITH POLAR SINGULARITIES

ARMEN EDIGARIAN AND JAN WIEGERINCK

ABSTRACT. We study the pluripolar hull of the graph of a holomorphic function f , defined on a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ outside a polar set $A \subset D$. This leads to a theorem that describes under what conditions f is nowhere extendable over A , while the graph of f over $D \setminus A$ is **not** complete pluripolar.

1. INTRODUCTION

Levenberg, Martin and Poletsky [8] have conjectured that if f is a holomorphic function, which is defined on its maximal domain of existence $D \subset \mathbb{C}$, then the graph

$$(1.1) \quad \Gamma_f = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in D\}$$

of f over D is a complete pluripolar subset of $\mathbb{C}^2$, i.e. there exists a plurisubharmonic function on $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that it equals $-\infty$ precisely on Γ_f (see e.g. [6]). Supports for this conjecture can be found in [8, 9, 16, 17, 18, 3].

In the same direction is one of the results of the paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let A be a closed polar set in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and let f be a holomorphic function on $D \setminus A$ (we shall write $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$). Then the set $\Gamma_f \cup (A \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, if f does not extend holomorphically over A , then the set $\Gamma_f \cup (A' \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$, where A' is the set of density points of A in D .*

In case $A' = \emptyset$ (i.e. A is a discrete subset of D), we see that the graph Γ_f of f on $D \setminus A$ is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$. Hence, Theorem 1.1 is a generalization of the main result of [17].

Nevertheless, in [4] we have shown that the conjecture is false. Moreover, for any non-empty set A' there exists a holomorphic function defined on $D \setminus A$, which is nowhere extendable over A , such that the graph Γ_f of f on $D \setminus A$ is not complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$. The main purpose of the paper is to clarify this phenomenon.

To study completeness of the graph we need more definitions. Following [19] (see also [9]) we introduce for a pluripolar set E in a domain D its *pluripolar hull in D* as

$$(1.2) \quad E_D^* := \{z \in D : \text{for all } u \in \text{PSH}(D) : u|_E = -\infty \implies u(z) = -\infty\}.$$

Date: 29 June 2002.

The first author was supported in part by the KBN grant No. 5 P03A 033 21. The first author is a fellow of the A. Krzyżanowski Foundation (Jagiellonian University).

It is well-known that a polar set P in $\mathbb{C}$ is complete polar if and only if P is of G_δ -type [7]. In higher dimension, the situation is more complicated. It is easy to see that any complete pluripolar set is of G_δ -type. The following result of A. Zeriahi is a useful counterpart of the one-dimensional case.

Theorem 1.2 (see [19]). *Let E be a pluripolar subset of a pseudoconvex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. If $E_D^* = E$ and E is of G_δ - and F_σ -type, then E is complete pluripolar in D .*

The next result is the main one of this paper. It is a one-variable necessary and sufficient condition on holomorphic functions on a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ that guarantees that the graph of such a function is complete pluripolar.

Theorem 1.3. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let A be a closed polar subset of D . Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$ and that $z_0 \in A$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $(\{z_0\} \times \mathbb{C}) \cap (\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^* = \emptyset$;
2. *the set $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is not thin at z_0 for any $R > 0$.*

Moreover, if the set $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is thin at z_0 for some $R > 0$, then there exists a $w_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, $|w_0| \leq R$, such that Γ_f is not pluri-thin at (z_0, w_0) (and therefore $(z_0, w_0) \in (\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^$).*

For the definition of thinness and pluri-thinness see (3.5) below and cp. [1, 6, 11].

Since any graph is of G_δ - and F_σ -type, as a corollary of Theorems 1.2, 1.3 we obtain the following.

Corollary 1.4. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let A be a closed polar subset of D . Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$. Then Γ_f is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$ if and only if for all $R > 0$ the set $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is not thin at any point of A .*

By Theorem 1.1 (see also [17]) in case A has no limit point in D , Γ_f is complete pluripolar (and in particular the regularity condition is satisfied) for every $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$, which does not extend holomorphically over A .

For example, the corollary applies to the function $f(z) = \exp(1/z)$, which is in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ and does not extend holomorphically to 0. Moreover, $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} : \operatorname{Re}(1/z) \geq \ln R\}$ is not thin at 0 for any $R > 0$. Hence, Γ_f is complete pluripolar in $\mathbb{C}^2$ as was already proven in [16], [17]. More interestingly, consider the function $f(z) = 1/\sin(\pi/z)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus A)$, where $A = \{0\} \cup \{1/n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. It is an amusing exercise to verify that in this case for any $R > 0$ the set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is not thin at any point of A showing again that Γ_f is complete pluripolar in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

The first named author thanks Marek Jarnicki and Peter Pflug for very helpful remarks. A conversation we had with Włodzimierz Zwonek was very useful too.

2. PLURIPOLAR COMPLETENESS

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We say that a plurisubharmonic function $u : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ is continuous if $e^u : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a continuous function and write $u \in \operatorname{PSHC}(\Omega)$.

The heart of this section is Theorem 2.1. Together with Corollary 3.2 and Theorem 3.3 it leads easily to Corollary 3.4. This in turn forms a basic ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 2.1 (cf. [17]). *Let K be a compact polar set in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus K)$. Then there exists a continuous plurisubharmonic function $u \in \text{PSHC}(D \times \mathbb{C})$ such that*

$$\{(z, w) \in D \times \mathbb{C} : u(z, w) = -\infty\} = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in D \setminus K\} \bigcup (K \times \mathbb{C}).$$

We postpone the proof Theorem 2.1 and start with some auxiliary results leading to Proposition 2.4.

Put $\mathbb{D}_r(z_0) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - z_0| < r\}$, $r > 0$, $\mathbb{D}_r := \mathbb{D}_r(0)$, and $\mathbb{D} := \mathbb{D}_1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let K be a compact set in the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ and let f be a holomorphic function in $\mathbb{D} \setminus K$. Then there exist $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D})$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad f = f_1 + f_2 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{D} \setminus K$$

and $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow +\infty} f_2(z) = 0$.

Proof. Take $r \in (0, 1)$ such that f is holomorphic in the annulus

$$A(r) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : r < |z| < 1\}.$$

Then

$$(2.2) \quad f(z) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k z^k, \quad z \in A(r).$$

Take $\tilde{f}_1(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$ and $\tilde{f}_2(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{-k} z^{-k}$. Then $\tilde{f}_1$ extends holomorphically to $\mathbb{D}$ (we denote the extension by f_1) and $\tilde{f}_2$ extends holomorphically to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}_r}$ (we denote the extension by f_2). We extend f_2 to $\overline{\mathbb{D}_r} \setminus K$ by the formula

$$f_2(z) = f(z) - f_1(z), \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}_r} \setminus K.$$

Note that $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let A be a polar set in $\mathbb{D}$. Then there exist a sequence $r_n \nearrow 1$ such that*

$$A \cap \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |z| = r_n\} = \emptyset, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Proof. This easily follows from the fact that linear measure (i.e., 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure) of A is zero (see [15], Theorem III.19). □

Proposition 2.4. *Let K be a compact polar set in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus K)$. Then there exist $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(D)$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad f = f_1 + f_2 \quad \text{on } D \setminus K$$

and $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} f_2(z) = 0$.

Proof. For any $z_0 \in K$ there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbb{D}_{r_0}(z_0) \subset D$ and $\partial\mathbb{D}_{r_0}(z_0) \cap K = \emptyset$ (use Lemma 2.3). From the compactness of K it follows that there exist points $z_1, \dots, z_N \in K$ and $r_1, \dots, r_N > 0$ such that

- a) $K \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N \mathbb{D}_{r_j}(z_j)$,
- b) $\partial\mathbb{D}_{r_j}(z_j) \cap K = \emptyset$, $j = 1, \dots, N$.

Now, we construct functions $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$ such that $f - (g_1 + \dots + g_N) \in \mathcal{O}(D)$.

By Lemma 2.2 there exists $g_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K_1)$, where $K_1 = K \cap \mathbb{D}_{r_1}(z_1)$, such that $f - g_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{r_1}(z_1))$.

Again by Lemma 2.2 there exists $g_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K_2)$, where $K_2 = (K \cap \mathbb{D}_{r_2}(z_2)) \setminus K_1$, such that $f - g_1 - g_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{r_1}(z_1) \cup \mathbb{D}_{r_2}(z_2))$. Repeating this process, we construct $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$ such that $f - (g_1 + \dots + g_N) \in \mathcal{O}(\bigcup_{j=1}^N \mathbb{D}_{r_j}(z_j))$. $\square$

For the proof of Theorem 2.1 we need the following result. The use of Jacobi series in this setting is well-known, cf. [12], [13].

Proposition 2.5. *Let K be a compact polar set in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$. Then there exist rational functions $r_n(z) = \frac{p_n(z)}{q_n(z)}$ of degree $\leq n$ (i.e., $\deg p_n \leq n$ and $\deg q_n \leq n$) with singularities in K (i.e., the zeros of q_n lie in K) such that for any compact set $L \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus K$ we have*

$$(2.4) \quad \|f - r_n\|_L^{\frac{1}{n}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{if } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_L$ means sup-norm in L .

Proof of Proposition 2.5. According to Proposition 2.4 there exist $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C})$ and $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus K)$ such that $f = f_1 + f_2$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus K$ and $f_2(z) \rightarrow 0$ when $|z| \rightarrow \infty$. So, we may assume that $f(z) \rightarrow 0$ when $|z| \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $U_n = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{dist}(z, K) < \frac{1}{n}\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then $U_{n+1} \Subset U_n$ and $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n = K$.

Let q_m denote the m -th Fekete polynomial (see e.g. [11]). Since K is polar, $\|q_m\|_K^{\frac{1}{m}} \rightarrow 0$, $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Take $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $L \Subset \mathbb{C} \setminus U_n$ and next $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|q_m\|_K^{\frac{1}{m}} < \frac{1}{n^4}$ for $m \geq m(n)$. Then for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U_{n^2}$

$$|q_m(z)| = \prod_{i=1}^m |z - z_i| \geq n^{-2m} > n^{2m} \|q_m\|_K =: \rho_m,$$

while for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus U_n$

$$|q_m(z)| \geq n^{-m} > n^m \rho_m.$$

Put $V_m = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |q_m(z)| > \rho_m\}$. Then $L \subset U_n^c \subset U_{n^2}^c \subset V_m$. Set

$$F_m(z, w) = \frac{1}{2\pi i q_m(z)} \int_{\partial V_m} \frac{f(\zeta)}{w q_m(\zeta) - 1} \cdot \frac{q_m(\zeta) - q_m(z)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta,$$

$$z \in V_m, |w| < \frac{1}{\rho_m}.$$

Then $F_m \in \mathcal{O}(V_m \times \mathbb{D}(\frac{1}{\rho_m}))$ and

$$F_m\left(z, \frac{1}{q_m(z)}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial V_m} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta = f(z),$$

for $z \in V_m$, because f vanishes at ∞ . Put

$$c_{mk}(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\partial V_m} f(\zeta) q_m^k(\zeta) \frac{q_m(\zeta) - q_m(z)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta.$$

Observe that c_{mk} is a polynomial of degree $\leq m-1$ and that

$$F(z, w) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_{mk}(z)}{q_m^k(z)} w^k.$$

Therefore,

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_{mk}(z)}{q_m^{k+1}(z)}.$$

Put $f_N(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{c_{mk}(z)}{q_m^{k+1}(z)}$. This is a rational function of degree mN . Let us estimate $f - f_N$ on $L \Subset U_n^c$. We have

$$|f(z) - f_N(z)| \leq \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} M_1 \frac{\rho_m^k}{\min_L |q_m(z)|^{k+1}} \leq M_2 \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} \left(\frac{n^{2m}}{n^{3m}}\right)^k \leq M_3 \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{mN}.$$

where $M_j > 0$ may depend on n, m but are independent of N . Hence, for sufficiently big N we have $|f(z) - f_N(z)|^{\frac{1}{mN}} \leq \frac{1}{n}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. In view of Proposition 2.4 we may assume that $D = \mathbb{C}$.

By Theorem 2.5 there exist rational functions $r_n = \frac{p_n}{q_n}$ of degree n , $n \geq 1$, such that

$$\|f - r_n\|_L^{\frac{1}{n}} \rightarrow 0$$

for any compact set $L \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus K$. We may assume that $q_n(z) = (z - a_{n1}) \dots (z - a_{nm_n})$, where $a_{n1}, \dots, a_{nm_n} \in K$, $m_n \leq n$.

Put

$$h_n(z, w) := \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \left(w - r_n(z) \right) q_n(z) \right|.$$

Then h_n is a continuous plurisubharmonic function in $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$.

We may assume that $K \subset \mathbb{D}$. For any $\nu \geq 2$ we put

$$D_\nu = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{D}_\nu : \text{dist}(z, K) > \frac{1}{\nu} \right\}.$$

Note that $D_\nu \subset\subset D_{\nu+1}$ and $\bigcup_\nu D_\nu = \mathbb{C} \setminus K$.

For $z \in D_\nu$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.5) \quad h_n(z, f(z)) &= \frac{1}{n} \log |(f(z) - r_n(z))q_n(z)| = \frac{1}{n} \log |f(z) - r_n(z)| \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \log |q_n(z)| \leq \log \|f - r_n\|_{D_\nu}^{\frac{1}{n}} + \log(\nu + 1) \\
 &= \log \left((\nu + 1) \|f - r_n\|_{D_\nu}^{\frac{1}{n}} \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|f - r_n\|_{D_\nu}^{\frac{1}{n}} \rightarrow 0$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, for any $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_1(\nu)$ such that for any $n \geq n_1(\nu)$

$$(2.6) \quad h_n(z, f(z)) \leq -\nu, \quad z \in D_\nu.$$

Fix $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. For $z \in D_\nu$, $w \in \mathbb{D}_\nu$, with $|w - f(z)| > \frac{1}{\nu}$ and $n \geq n_1(\nu)$ we have, using (2.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.7) \quad h_n(z, w) &= \frac{1}{n} \log |(w - f(z))q_n(z) + (f(z) - r_n(z))q_n(z)| \geq \\
 &\quad \frac{1}{n} \log \left| \left(\frac{1}{\nu} \right)^{n+1} - e^{-\nu n} \right| \geq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} \right)^{n+1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $n_2(\nu) \geq n_1(\nu)$ such that for $n \geq n_2(\nu)$ we have

$$(2.8) \quad h_n(z, w) \geq -\log(\nu + 1).$$

Let us estimate h_n on $\mathbb{D}_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu$. Since $\|f - r_n\|_{\{z \in \mathbb{C}: |z|=\nu\}}^{\frac{1}{n}} \rightarrow 0$, for sufficiently big $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\max_{|z| \leq \nu} |p_n(z)| = \max_{|z|=\nu} |p_n(z)| \leq C_\nu \max_{|z|=\nu} |q_n(z)|,$$

where $C_\nu = \max_{|z|=\nu} |f(z)| + 1$. Hence, there exists $n_3(\nu) \geq n_2(\nu)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.9) \quad h_n(z, w) &= \frac{1}{n} \log |wq_n(z) - p_n(z)| \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\nu(\nu + 1)^n + C_\nu(\nu + 1)^n \right) \leq \log(\nu + 2), \\
 &\quad n \geq n_3(\nu), (z, w) \in \mathbb{D}_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu.
 \end{aligned}$$

For any ν fix an $n(\nu) \geq n_3(\nu)$. Now, we consider the plurisubharmonic functions

$$u_\nu(z, w) = \max\{h_{n(\nu)}(z, w) - \log(\nu + 2), -\nu - \log(\nu + 2)\}.$$

As u_ν is negative on $\mathbb{D}_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu$, the series

$$(2.10) \quad u(z, w) := \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\nu^2} u_\nu(z, w).$$

represents a plurisubharmonic function. It is not identically $-\infty$ because of (2.8), while (2.6) shows that it is $-\infty$ on the graph of f . Finally, the function $u(z, w) + H(z)$, where $H(z)$ is the Evans' potential of K (see e.g. [11]), satisfies all our conditions. $\square$

3. RESULTS FROM POTENTIAL AND PLURIPOTENTIAL THEORIES

In 3.1 we assemble some results mainly of Levenberg and Poletsky, [9]. Next, in 3.2 we turn to potential theory in $\mathbb{C}$. We will obtain some auxiliary results that look very classical. Yet we could not find them in the literature.

3.1. Pluripotential theory. For a pluripolar set E in a domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n$, Levenberg and Poletsky define the *negative pluripolar hull of E in D* as

$$E_D^- := \{z \in D : \text{for all } u \in \text{PSH}(D), u \leq 0 : u|_E = -\infty \implies u(z) = -\infty\}.$$

We have the following relation between pluripolar and negative pluripolar hulls.

Theorem 3.1 (see [9]). *Let D be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $E \subset D$ be pluripolar. Suppose that $D = \bigcup_j D_j$, where $D_j \subset D_{j+1}$ form an increasing sequence of relatively compact pseudoconvex subdomains of D . Then*

$$E_D^* = \bigcup_j (E \cap D_j)_{D_j}^-.$$

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 3.1 we get the following.

Corollary 3.2. *Let G be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $E \subset G \times \mathbb{C}$ be a pluripolar set, which is of F_σ - and G_δ -type. Then E is complete pluripolar in $G \times \mathbb{C}$ iff $E \cap (D \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$ for any domain $D \Subset G$.*

Proof. Note that if E is complete pluripolar in $G \times \mathbb{C}$ then E is complete pluripolar in any smaller domain.

Take a sequence of domains $D_1 \Subset D_2 \Subset \dots \Subset G$ such that $G = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^\infty D_\nu$. By Theorem 1.2 E is complete pluripolar in $G \times \mathbb{C}$ iff $E_{G \times \mathbb{C}}^* = E$. By Theorem 3.1 we have

$$E_{G \times \mathbb{C}}^* = \bigcup_{\nu=1}^\infty (E \cap (D_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu))_{D_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu}^-.$$

We know that

$$(E \cap (D_{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{C}))_{D_{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{C}}^* \supset (E \cap (D_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu))_{D_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_\nu}^-, \quad \nu = 1, 2, \dots$$

So, if $(E \cap (D_{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{C}))_{D_{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{C}}^* = E \cap (D_{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{C})$, then $E_{G \times \mathbb{C}}^* = E$. $\square$

In view of Theorem 2.1 recall the following result of A. Zeriahi (see [19]).

Theorem 3.3. *Let D be a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let Z be a closed complete pluripolar set in D . Then there exists a continuous plurisubharmonic function $u \in \text{PSHC}(D)$ such that $\{z \in D : u(z) = -\infty\} = Z$.*

As a corollary of Theorems 2.1 and 3.3, Corollary 3.2 we get the following.

Corollary 3.4. *Let A be a closed polar set in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$. Then there exists a continuous plurisubharmonic function $u \in \text{PSHC}(D \times \mathbb{C})$ such that*

$$\{(z, w) \in D \times \mathbb{C} : u(z, w) = -\infty\} = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in D \setminus A\} \bigcup (A \times \mathbb{C}).$$

In particular, $(\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^* \cap [(D \setminus A) \times \mathbb{C}] = \Gamma_f \cap [(D \setminus A) \times \mathbb{C}]$.

Proof. Let $G \Subset D$ be a domain such that $\partial G \cap A = \emptyset$. Then $A \cap G$ is a compact polar subset of G . By Theorem 2.1 the set $\{(z, f(z)) : z \in G \setminus A\} \cup ((A \cap G) \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar in $G \times \mathbb{C}$. Using Corollary 3.2 we get that $\{(z, f(z)) : z \in D \setminus A\} \cup (A \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$. The existence of a continuous plurisubharmonic function follows from Theorem 3.3. $\square$

Let E be a subset of a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. The *pluriharmonic measure* of E relative to D (or, *relative extremal function*) is defined as follows

$$(3.1) \quad \omega(z, E, D) = -\sup\{u(z) : u \in \text{PSH}(D) \text{ and } u \leq -1 \text{ on } E, u \leq 0 \text{ on } D\},$$

$$z \in D.$$

We refer to [6] for details. Note that relative extremal function can be defined as in (3.1) for an open set D . In that case we have $\omega(z, E, D) = \omega(z, E \cap D_j, D_j)$, $z \in D_j$, where $D = \cup_j D_j$, D_j are disjoint and connected.

Recall the following important result.

Theorem 3.5 (see [9]). *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let E be a pluripolar set in D . Then*

$$E_D^- = \{z \in D : \omega(z, E, D) > 0\}.$$

The next localization principle is an important tool in our theory. A very special case of this principle can be found in [17].

Theorem 3.6. *Let G be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let E be a pluripolar subset of G . Assume that u is a plurisubharmonic function on G such that*

$$(3.2) \quad Z = \{z \in G : u(z) = -\infty\} \supset E$$

and u is locally bounded on $G \setminus Z$ (e.g. $u \in \text{PSHC}(G)$). Then for any domain $D \Subset G$ and any neighborhood $U \supset Z$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad \omega(z, E \cap D, D) = \omega(z, E \cap D, U \cap D), \quad z \in U \cap D.$$

Proof. Fix a domain $D \Subset G$. Since $U \cap D \subset D$, we have the inequality " $\geq$ ".

Let us show the inequality " $\leq$ ". Note that $Z \cap \overline{D}$ is a compact set. Assume that $h \in \text{PSH}(D \cap U)$ is such that $h \leq -1$ on $E \cap D$ and $h \leq 0$ on $U \cap D$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist $\alpha > 0$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha u + \beta < 0$ on D , $\alpha u + \beta \geq -\epsilon$ on $(\partial U) \cap \overline{D}$.

Consider the function

$$v_\epsilon(z) := \begin{cases} \max\{h(z) - \epsilon, \alpha u(z) + \beta\} & \text{if } z \in D \cap U, \\ \alpha u(z) + \beta & \text{if } z \in D \setminus U. \end{cases}$$

Note that $v_\epsilon \in \text{PSH}(D)$ is a negative plurisubharmonic function such that $v_\epsilon \leq -1$ on $E \cap D$. Hence,

$$-\omega(z, E \cap D, D) \geq v_\epsilon(z) \geq h(z) - \epsilon, \quad z \in D \cap U.$$

Let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then $-\omega(z, E \cap D, D) \geq h(z)$, $z \in D \cap U$. And, therefore,

$$\omega(z, E \cap D, D) \leq \omega(z, E \cap D, U \cap D).$$

$\square$

3.2. Potential theory. The following result from potential theory is very important in our considerations. Since we could not find the proof in the literature, we give the proof.

Theorem 3.7. *Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $S \subset D$ be a closed disc. Assume that $K \subset \partial D$ is a compact polar set. Then*

$$\omega(z, S, D) = \inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\}, \quad z \in D.$$

Moreover, if $z \in K$ is a regular boundary point of D then

$$\inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\} = 0.$$

Proof. To prove the first statement, it is clear that for each $z \in D$

$$\omega(z, S, D) \leq \inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\}.$$

Next, because K is a compact polar set, there exists a subharmonic function $h \leq 0$ that is defined in a neighborhood of $\bar{D}$ and such that $h(w) = -\infty$ if and only if $w \in K$. Let $z \in D$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let U_0 be a small neighborhood of K , such that $\varepsilon h < -1$ on U_0 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\} + \varepsilon h(z) &\leq \\ \omega(z, S, D \cup U_0) + \varepsilon h(z) &\leq \omega(z, S, D), \end{aligned}$$

because $\omega(z, S, D \cup U_0) + \varepsilon h(z)$ is a subharmonic function on $D \setminus S$ with boundary values less than the boundary values of $\omega(z, S, D)$. Since $h(z)$ is a fixed finite value, and ε is arbitrary > 0 , we have

$$\omega(z, S, D) \geq \inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\}.$$

and the first statement is established.

For the second statement we first observe that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ the set

$$F_U^\varepsilon = \{z \in \overline{D \cup U} : \limsup_{\zeta \rightarrow z} \omega(\zeta, S, D \cup U) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

is a compact connected subset of $\overline{D \cup U}$. Moreover, if $U_1 \subset U_2$ then $F_{U_1}^\varepsilon \subset F_{U_2}^\varepsilon$. We set $F^\varepsilon = \bigcap_U F_U^\varepsilon$. Then F^ε is a compact connected subset of $\bar{D}$.

Now let $z \in K$ be a regular boundary point of D . Then

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow z, \zeta \in D} \omega(\zeta, S, D) = 0,$$

because it is the solution of a Dirichlet problem with continuous boundary values. Moreover, if $z \notin K$, then for sufficiently small neighborhoods U of K we find that z is a regular boundary point of $D \cup U$. We conclude that $F^\varepsilon \cap \partial D$ is a subset of the union of K and the irregular boundary points of D , hence $F^\varepsilon \cap \partial D$ is a polar set and therefore totally disconnected.

To reach a contradiction, suppose that

$$\inf\{\omega(z, S, D \cup U) : K \subset U \text{ open}\} = \varepsilon > 0,$$

then $z \in F^\varepsilon$. Note that for any decreasing sequence $\{U_i\}$ of neighborhoods of K with $K = \bigcap U_i$, the functions $\omega(z, S, D \cup U_i)$ form a decreasing sequence of harmonic functions on $D \setminus S$ and therefore converge uniformly on compact sets in $D \setminus S$ to $\omega(z, S, D)$.

In view of (3.4) we conclude that there is a neighborhood V of z such that $F^\varepsilon \cap V \subset \partial D$. Thus $F^\varepsilon \cap V$ is totally disconnected and $\{z\}$ is a component of F^ε , which is a contradiction. $\square$

Let S be a subset of $\mathbb{C}$ and let $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$. Recall (cf. [11]) that S is called *thin* at ζ if ζ is not a point of density of S or there exists a subharmonic function u defined in a neighborhood of ζ with

$$(3.5) \quad \limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow \zeta \\ z \in S \setminus \{\zeta\}}} u(z) < u(\zeta).$$

The definition of *pluri-thin* is entirely analogous: Instead of working in $\mathbb{C}$ one works in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and the subharmonic function u must be replaced by a plurisubharmonic function.

It is known that it is equivalent to demand in (3.5) that the limsup equals $-\infty$, compare the proof of the Wiener criterion in [11], and for the several variable case [6].

Next we see that thin boundary points behave as interior points as far as harmonic measure is concerned.

Proposition 3.8. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $B \subset D$ be a closed subset. Suppose that $z_0 \in D$ is such that B is thin at z_0 . Then there exist a sequence of radius $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset (0, 1)$, $r_n \rightarrow 0$, and a sequence $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset D \setminus B$, $z_k \rightarrow z_0$, such that $\mathbb{D}(z_0, r) \Subset D$, $\partial\mathbb{D}(z_0, r) \subset D \setminus B$, and*

$$\omega(z_k, \partial\mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n), \mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n) \setminus B) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad n, k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. Since B is thin at z_0 , we can find a subharmonic function u defined on a neighborhood of z_0 such that

$$\limsup_{\substack{z \rightarrow z_0 \\ z \in B \setminus \{z_0\}}} u(z) = -\infty < u(z_0).$$

Moreover, by scaling and adding a constant, we can assume that $u(z_0) = -\frac{1}{3}$ and $u < 0$ on a small ball $\mathbb{D}(z_0, \epsilon)$.

It is an immediate consequence of Wiener's criterion that there exists a sequence of radii $r_n \searrow 0$ such that the circles $\partial\mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n)$ do not intersect B (see e.g. [11, Theorem 5.4.2.]). Pick n_0 so big that $u|_{B \cap \{0 < |z - z_0| < r_{n_0}\}} \leq -1$. We assume that $n \geq n_0$. We use the fact that D is non-thin at z_0 to find a sequence $\{z_k\} \subset D \setminus B$ tending to z_0 such that $u(z_k) \rightarrow u(z_0)$. We assume that $u(z_k) \geq -\frac{1}{2}$. Note that

$$-\omega(z, \partial\mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n), \mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n) \setminus B) + u(z) \leq -1, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n) \setminus B.$$

In particular, $\omega(z_k, \partial\mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n), \mathbb{D}(z_0, r_n) \setminus B) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. □

4. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

The next result gives the proof of implication (1) $\implies$ (2) and the second part of Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 4.1. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$, let A be a closed polar subset of D , and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$. Assume that there exist a $z_0 \in A$ and an $R > 0$ such that $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is thin at z_0 . Then there exists a $w_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, $|w_0| \leq R$, such that Γ_f is not pluri-thin at (z_0, w_0) (and, therefore, $(z_0, w_0) \in (\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^*$).*

Proof. We may assume that $z_0 = 0$. Put $B = A \cup \{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$. Note that B is a closed subset of D thin at 0. By Proposition 3.8 there exist a sequence of radius $\{r_n\}$, $r_n \rightarrow 0$, and a sequence $\{z_k\} \subset D \setminus B$ tending to 0 such that

$$\omega(z_k, \partial\mathbb{D}_{r_n}, \mathbb{D}_{r_n} \setminus B) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let w_0 be a limit point of $\{f(z_k)\}$; clearly $|w_0| \leq R$. By passing to a subsequence we can assume that $f(z_k) \rightarrow w_0$.

We shall show that Γ_f is not pluri-thin at $(0, w_0)$. Indeed, assume that Γ_f is pluri-thin at $(0, w_0)$. Then there exists a plurisubharmonic function $u \in \text{PSH}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ such that

$$\limsup_{\Gamma_f \ni (z, w) \rightarrow (0, w_0)} u(z, w) = -\infty < u(0, w_0).$$

Consider the subharmonic functions

$$h_k(z) = u(z - z_k, f(z) + w_0 - f(z_k))$$

defined on $D \setminus A$. We have $h_k(z_k) = u(0, w_0)$.

Put $H = \sup_{|z| \leq 2, |w| \leq 3R} u(z, w)$ and put $C_{nk} = \sup_{z \in \partial\mathbb{D}_{r_n}} h_k(z)$, $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $C_{nk} \rightarrow C_n = \sup_{z \in \partial\mathbb{D}_{r_n}} u(z, f(z))$, when $k \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, $C_n \rightarrow -\infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We have $h_k \leq H$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}_{r_n} \setminus B$. We estimate $u(0, w_0) = h_k(z_k)$ using the two-constants theorem:

$$u(0, w_0) = h_k(z_k) \leq H - (H - C_{nk})\omega(z_k, \partial\mathbb{D}_{r_n}, \mathbb{D}_{r_n} \setminus B) \leq \frac{H + C_{nk}}{2}.$$

Now we let $k \rightarrow \infty$. So, $u(0, w_0) \leq \frac{H + C_n}{2}$. If we let $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get $u(0, w_0) = -\infty$. A contradiction. $\square$

For the proof of implication (2) $\implies$ (1) in Theorem 1.3 we need the following technical result, which follows from the localization principle (Theorem 3.6), Theorem 3.7, and Corollary 3.4.

Corollary 4.2. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let A be a closed polar subset of D . Assume that $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$ and that $S \subset D \setminus A$ is a closed disc. Then for any domain $G \Subset D$ and any $R_2 > R_1 > 0$ such that $S \subset G$, $A \cap \partial G = \emptyset$, $R_1 > \max_{z \in S} |f(z)|$ we have*

$$\omega(z, S, G_{R_1}) \leq \omega((z, f(z)), \Gamma_S, G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_2}) \leq \omega(z, S, G_{R_2}), \quad z \in G_{R_1},$$

where $\Gamma_S = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in S\}$ and $G_R = \{z \in G \setminus A : |f(z)| < R\}$. Moreover, if $z_0 \in A$ is a regular point of G_{R_2} then

$$\omega((z_0, w_0), \Gamma_S, G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) = 0, \quad \text{for any } w_0 \in \mathbb{D}_{R_1}.$$

Proof. Note that $Z = \Gamma_f \cup (A \times \mathbb{C})$ is a closed complete pluripolar set in $D \times \mathbb{C}$ (use Corollary 3.4).

Fix a neighborhood V of $A \cap G$. Put $\tilde{V} = V \cup (D \setminus \overline{G})$ and put

$$U = (\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| < R_2\} \cup \tilde{V}) \times \mathbb{C} \\ \bigcup \{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| > R_1\} \times \{w \in \mathbb{C} : |w| > R_1\}.$$

Note that U is a neighborhood of Z . According to the localization principle we have

$$\begin{aligned}\omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) &= \omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, (G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) \cap U), \\ (z, w) &\in (G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) \cap U.\end{aligned}$$

We have $(G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) \cap U = (G_{R_2} \cup V) \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) &= \omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, (G_{R_2} \cup V) \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}), \\ (z, w) &\in (G_{R_2} \cup V) \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}.\end{aligned}$$

Now it suffices to use the inequalities

$$\omega((z, f(z)), \Gamma_S, G \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) \geq \omega(z, S, G_{R_1}), \quad z \in G_{R_1},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, (G_{R_2} \cup V) \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1}) &\leq \omega(z, S, G_{R_2} \cup V), \\ (z, w) &\in (G_{R_2} \cup V) \times \mathbb{D}_{R_1},\end{aligned}$$

and Theorem 3.7. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Note that all we have to prove is the implication (2) $\implies$ (1).

Let S be a closed disc in $D \setminus A$. Put

$$\Gamma_S := \{(z, f(z)) : z \in S\}.$$

Let M be the maximum of $|f|$ on S and let $R_\nu \nearrow +\infty$.

Fix domains $D_\nu \Subset D_{\nu+1} \subset D$ such that $\cup_\nu D_\nu = D$ and $\partial D_\nu \cap A = \emptyset$. According to Corollary 4.2

$$\omega((z_0, w_0), \Gamma_S, D_\nu \times \mathbb{D}_{R_\nu}) = 0, \quad \text{for any } w_0 \in \mathbb{D}_{R_\nu}, \nu \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence, $(\Gamma_S)_{D_\nu \times R_\nu}^- \cap (\{z_0\} \times \mathbb{C}) = \emptyset$, for any $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. So, $(\Gamma_S)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^* \cap (\{z_0\} \times \mathbb{C}) = \emptyset$. It suffices to remark that $(\Gamma_S)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^* = (\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^*$. $\square$

Theorem 1.1 immediately follows from the following more general result.

Theorem 4.3 (cf. [17]). *Let A be a closed polar set in a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$. Let B be a subset of A such that $B \cap A' = \emptyset$. Assume that f does not extend holomorphically to any point of B . Then the set*

$$\{(z, f(z)) : z \in D \setminus A\} \bigcup ((A \setminus B) \times \mathbb{C})$$

is complete pluripolar in $D \times \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Note that the set B has only isolated points. According to Corollary 3.4 we know that $\Gamma_f \cup (A \times \mathbb{C})$ is complete pluripolar. Since $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is not-thin at any point of B (because f has isolated singularities at any point of B), by Theorem 1.3 we have the proof. $\square$

The following result gives some information on the set $(\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^*$ in case f is not extendable over a polar subset A .

Theorem 4.4. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}$ and let $A \subset D$ be a closed polar subset. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{O}(D \setminus A)$ and f does not extend holomorphically over A . Then there exists a dense subset $B \subset A$ such that $(\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^* \cap (B \times \mathbb{C}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. According to a result from [2] there exists a dense subset $B \subset A$ with the following property: for any $b \in B$ there exists a continuous curve $\gamma : (0, 1] \rightarrow D \setminus A$ such that $\gamma(t) \rightarrow b$ and $|f(\gamma(t))| \rightarrow \infty$ when $t \rightarrow 0$. Hence, for any $b \in B$ and any $R > 0$ the set $\{z \in D \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\}$ is not thin at b . So, the result follows from Theorem 1.3 $\square$

5. EXAMPLES

In case $\Gamma_f \neq (\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^*$, it is natural to try to determine the non-trivial part of $(\Gamma_f)_{D \times \mathbb{C}}^*$. In Proposition 5.2 we will compute the pluripolar hull of particular examples. We introduce some notation for this section. Let $A = \{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ be a sequence such that $a_n \rightarrow 0$ and let $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Put

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_n}{z - a_n}.$$

We will suppose that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n| < +\infty$ and that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{c_n}{a_n} \right|$ is convergent. We also introduce $\gamma_N = \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} |c_n|$. Note that $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} \setminus (A \cup \{0\}))$ and that $f(0)$ is well-defined. First let us show the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that there exists a sequence $N_m \nearrow \infty$ such that*

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N_m} \log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_{N_m+1}} = 0.$$

Then

$$(\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^* \subset \Gamma_f \cup \{(0, f(0))\}.$$

Proof. Since $a_n \rightarrow 0$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log |a_n| = -\infty$. Hence, from (5.1) we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_m} \log \gamma_{N_m+1} = -\infty$. Put

$$f_N(z) = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{c_n}{z - a_n}$$

and

$$h_N(z, w) = \frac{1}{N} \log \left| (w - f_N(z)) \prod_{n=1}^N (z - a_n) \right|.$$

Note that h_N is a plurisubharmonic function on $\mathbb{C}^2$. Fix $R > 0$ and let $|z|, |w| < R$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} h_N(z, w) &\leq \frac{1}{N} \log \left(R \prod_{n=1}^N (R + |a_n|) + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{|c_k|}{R + |a_k|} \prod_{n=1}^N (R + |a_n|) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \log \left(R + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{|c_k|}{R} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \log \left(\prod_{n=1}^N (R + |a_n|) \right) := M_N. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $M_N \rightarrow \log R$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Fix a closed disc $\overline{\mathbb{D}}(z_0, 2r_0) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{A}$. Let us estimate $h_N(z, f(z))$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}(z_0, r_0)$. We have

$$h_N(z, f(z)) \leq \frac{1}{N} \log \left(\left(\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{|c_n|}{r_0} \right) \prod_{n=1}^N (r_0 + |a_n|) \right) := K_N.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{N_m} \log \gamma_{N_m+1}}{K_{N_m}} = 1.$$

Put $v_N(z, w) = \frac{M_N - h_N(z, w)}{M_N - K_N}$. If $w \neq f(0)$ then

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} v_{N_m}(0, w) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N_m} \log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_{N_m+1}} = 0.$$

From the definition we have

$$\omega((z, w), \Gamma_S, \mathbb{D}_R \times \mathbb{D}_R) \leq v_N(z, w), \quad z, w \in \mathbb{D}_R,$$

where $S = \overline{\mathbb{D}}(z_0, r_0)$ and $\Gamma_S = \{(z, f(z)) : z \in S\}$. So, if $w \neq f(0)$ and $w \in \mathbb{D}_R$ then

$$0 \leq \omega((0, w), \Gamma_S, \mathbb{D}_R \times \mathbb{D}_R) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} v_{N_m}(0, w) = 0.$$

Hence, $(0, w) \notin (\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^*$. □

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_n} < +\infty$. Then*

$$(\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^* = \Gamma_f \cup \{(0, f(0))\}.$$

Proof. Fix $N > k > 1$. Note that

$$\frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_{N+1}} \leq \frac{\sum_{n=1}^k \log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_{N+1}} + \sum_{n=k+1}^N \frac{\log |a_n|}{\log \gamma_n}.$$

From this inequality we get that condition (5.1) is satisfied and by Proposition 5.1 we have $(\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^* \subset \Gamma_f \cup \{(0, f(0))\}$.

So, it suffices to show that $(\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^* \neq \Gamma_f$. It is not difficult to see that $\frac{|a_n|}{\sqrt{\gamma_n}} \rightarrow \infty$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|a_n| > r_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $r_n = C\sqrt{\gamma_n}$. Because $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|\log \gamma_n|} < \infty$, we find

$$R := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|c_n|}{r_n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\gamma_n} \frac{|c_n|}{C\gamma_n} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\gamma_n} < +\infty.$$

Put $A = \{0\} \cup \{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and put $F := \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\mathbb{D}(a_n, r_n)}$. We have

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus A : |f(z)| \geq R\} \subset F.$$

According to Theorem 1.3, it suffices to show that F is thin at 0. But this is a variation on Wiener's criterion, see e.g. [11]. Indeed, there exists a sequence $\alpha_n \nearrow \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \frac{\log \left(\frac{|a_n|}{1+|a_n|} \right)}{\log r_n} < +\infty.$$

Consider the function

$$u(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{\log \frac{1}{r_n}} [\log |z - a_n| - \log(1 + |a_n|)].$$

Note that u is a negative subharmonic function on $\mathbb{D}$ and that $u(0) > -\infty$. We have

$$u(z) \leq \frac{\alpha_n}{\log \frac{1}{r_n}} [\log r_n - \log(1 + |a_n|)], \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}(a_n, r_n)}.$$

Hence,

$$\limsup_{F \ni z \rightarrow 0} u(z) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{\log \frac{1}{r_n}} [\log r_n - \log(1 + |a_n|)] = -\infty < u(0).$$

We obtain that F is thin at 0. $\square$

Example 5.3. Take $a_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $c_n = e^{-n^2}/n^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Put

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_n}{z - a_n}.$$

Then by Propostion 5.2 we have $(\Gamma_f)_{\mathbb{C}^2}^* = \Gamma_f \cup \{(0, f(0))\}$.

REFERENCES

1. M. Brelot, *On Topologies and Boundaries in Potential theory*, Springer-Verlag, LNM 175, 1971.
2. M.L. Cartwright, *On the asymptotic values of functions with a non-enumerable set of essential singularities*, J. London Math. Soc., 11 (1936), 303–306.
3. A. Edigarian, *Pluripolar hulls and holomorphic coverings*, Israel J. Math., to appear, (2001).
4. A. Edigarian & J. Wiergerinck, *Graphs that are not complete pluripolar*, Proc. Ams. Math. Soc., to appear. E-preprint: <http://front.math.ucdavis.edu> title/id: CV/0203064.
5. B. Josefson, *On the equivalence between locally polar and globally polar sets for plurisubharmonic functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Ark. Mat., **16** (1978), 109–115.
6. M. Klimek, *Pluripotential Theory*, London Math. Soc. Monographs, 6, Clarendon Press, 1991.
7. N.S. Landkoff, *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*, Grundle. Math. Wiss. 180, Springer, 1972.
8. N. Levenberg, G. Martin & E.A. Poletsky, *Analytic disks and pluripolar sets*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 41 (1992), 515–532.
9. N. Levenberg & E.A. Poletsky, *Pluripolar hulls*, Michigan Math. J., 46 (1999), 151–162.
10. K. Noshiro, *Cluster sets*, Springer-Verlag, 1960.
11. Th. Ransford, *Potential Theory in the Complex Plane*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
12. A. Sadullaev, *Plurisubharmonic measures and capacities on complex manifolds*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, 36 (1981), 53–105.
13. A. Sadullaev, *Rational approximations and pluripolar sets*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) 119 (1982), 96–118.
14. A. Sadullaev, *A criterion for fast rational approximation in $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **125** (1984), 269–279.
15. M. Tsuji, *Potential Theory in Modern Function Theory*, 1959.
16. J. Wiergerinck, *The pluripolar hull of $\{w = e^{-\frac{1}{z}}\}$* , Ark. Mat., **38** (2000), 201–208.
17. J. Wiergerinck, *Graphs of holomorphic functions with isolated singularities are complete pluripolar*, Michigan Math. J., **47** (2000), 191–197.
18. J. Wiergerinck, *Pluripolar sets: hulls and completeness*.

19. A. Zeriahi, *Ensembles pluripolaires exceptionnels pour la croissance partielle des fonctions holomorphes*, Ann. Polon. Math., **50** (1989), 81–91.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY, REYMONTA 4/526, 30-059
KRAKÓW, POLAND

E-mail address: `edigaria@im.uj.edu.pl`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, PLANTAGE MUIDERGRACHT
24, 1018 TV, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

E-mail address: `janwieg@science.uva.nl`